DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 511 CE 011 086

AUTHOR Marienau, Catherine; Klinger, Karla
TITLE An Anthropological Approach to the Study of Educational Barriers of Adults at the Postsecondary Level.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference (Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 20-22, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Adult Students; *Educational Anthropology; *Educational Opportunities; *Educational Problems; Educational Research; Environmental Influences; Family Influence; *Post Secondary Education; Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS Educational Barriers; Minnesota

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted on 42 adults in west central Minnesota to identify emerging patterns of educational barriers, explore the relationships among the barriers, and determine the effect barriers have in influencing the adult learner's participation in education. The study used three anthropological fieldwork techniques: Network analysis using the referral technique to identify the research population (the 12 primary subjects referred the investigators to 30 others); ethnographic data collection through indepth personal interviews; and ethnoscience techniques used in the organization and analysis of the data. (Ethnoscience is defined as a mode of eliciting, in a rigorous way, the means by which a culture structures meaning for its participants.) Five main categories of barriers were identified: Access to educational facilities, family responsibilities, finances, time, and motivation. The investigators found that over two-thirds of the participants reported the presence of two or more barriers and that the barriers were intricately related to one another. Three generalizations were reached: Barriers are derived from the situations people face and the value orientations people hold; value-related barriers require personal readjustments by the adult learner; and situational barriers have the potential to be overcome by external sources. (Implications of the study for adult educators and for the authors' own situation are also explored.) (LMS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

.040

ED141511

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL BARRIERS OF ADULTS AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Script for a Presentation:
Adult Education Research Conference

April 20-22, 1977
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Catherine Marienau
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Karla Klinger
University of Minnesota, Morris

OE 6/10/80

The research we are presenting on "educational barriers of adults at the postsecondary level" focuses on how that problem is perceived by an adult population in west central Minnesota. We have distinguished the basic approach to the research problem as anthropological. This approach will be illustrated through a description of the research methodology and through an interpretation of the findings and the application of these findings within a specific postsecondary program.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

By way of providing a conceptual framework for the barrier research, we wish to first view the problem of educational barriers of adults in relationship to the larger issue of adults' access to education. We will briefly consider certain conditions influencing adults' access to education and the attention which has been given to research in this area.

American society supports the notions that education is the privilege and obligation of youth; that work and family management are the responsibilities of adulthood; and that retirement and leisure are events withheld for the aged. Educationally-minded adults often confront this "segmented life"[1] phenomenon in their attempts to gain access to educational institutions which respond only minimally to the needs of society's age and role-defined populations.

Education has even more challenging responsibilities with regard to providing access for an adult population. Today's generation of adults is faced with managing a culture that is different <u>in kind</u> from the one originally transmitted to them.[2]

Adults who seek access to education as a means of responding and adapting to cultural changes experience serious institutional restrictions. They confront educational systems that are confining in time, space, and youth-oriented traditions. The personal, professional and social needs adults bring to educational institutions differ from those of the favored youth population; yet their needs are often peripheral to the main functions of the institution. The complex, dynamic culture in which we live continues, however, to exert great pressures on education to develop a capacity within each individual to learn, to change, to create a new culture throughout his or her lifespan.[3]

These dominating conditions pose complex problems concerning adults' access

to education which need to be investigated from a variety of perspectives and methodologies. The most prevalent approach to the access question has been to investigate the ways in which adults participate in institution-sponsored educational offerings. Various studies have produced findings concerning adults' subject interests, their preferred modes of study and their selection of institutional settings.

While continued research in this area is needed, the issue of adults' access to education also needs to be investigated with respect to those conditions which prohibit adults from participating in postsecondary education. The question of educational barriers has typically been a minor factor under investigation within quantitative studies primarily concerned with the adult participation issue. Thus, the findings concerning educational barriers have been limited to defining categories of barriers.

In the well-known 1965 national study of adult learners, Johnstone and Rivera identified two main categories of barriers: 1) situational (influences external to the individual's control) and, 2) dispositional (individual's personal attitudes toward participation).[4] Another national study in 1974, sponsored by the Educational Testing Service, explored what reasons that respondents "felt were important in keeping them from learning what they want to learn".[5] Using Johnstone's taxonomy, this study identified primarily situational barriers. Geographically restricted surveys of adults' participation in postsecondary education in Wisconsin (1973)[6] and in California (1975)[7] also reported situational and dispositional types of barriers.

While evidence of this type supports the existence of educational barriers of adults, it is limited in its application to understanding the needs of an adult population and ways in which institutions might effectively respond. The research we will now present on educational barriers stemmed from our attempts to extend university offerings to adults in a particular geographic area.

BARRIER RESEARCH CONTEXT

The Morris Learning Center, located 150 miles due west of Minneapolis in west central Minnesota farmland, is the University of Minnesota's response to adult learners who are often geographically isolated from the Morris campus and from access to educational opportunities at the undergraduate level. The Center offers the University Without Walls (UWW) external baccalaureate degree option, and since 1975, has also sought to provide course opportunities through other external delivery systems.

Most of the people who responded in 1974 to the publicity about the pilot BAW program had educational barriers such as jobs and family responsibilities. We were able to identify their barriers and to categorize them. However, we soon found that knowing what the barriers were did not tell us what the barriers meant, or how barriers functioned in peoples' lives, or under what circumstances they might be overcome. We wondered why two students with seemingly identical barriers made opposite programmatic decisions? How did the adult's own perceptions of barriers contribute to determining whether that adult decided to participate in educational opportunities? As the Morris Learning Center broadened its services, it became increasingly important to answer these questions. If we could understand the range and function of barriers from the adult perspective, perhaps the Morris Learning Center could serve these same adults more effectively.

METHODOLOGY

While previous studies provided data concerning the types of educational barriers adults face, the data did not address the kinds of questions we were asking about adults' perceptions of the range and functions of barriers to continuing education. We determined that the commonly used quantitative, standard-response approach was not suited for investigating the nature of our research problem.

We applied several criteria in selecting methodology that would be compatible with the aims of the research. The first criterion was that the data should be influenced as little as possible by our biases as adult educators and, instead, should reflect the perspectives of the adult population. Second, the data should be analyzed to not only define categories of barriers, but to identify the relationships of their variables and the influences of those variables upon the adult learner's participation in education. Finally, the data should be communicated in a form to provide direction for programming possibilities for adult learners in the Morris Learning Center region.

We selected methods often used in anthropological fieldwork as meeting these basic criteria. Three anthropological fieldwork methods were applied in the study, involving selection of the research sample, data collection, and data analysis. Our basic approach was to explore a range of questions with the research population concerning barriers to education and to allow patterns to emerge which would increase our understanding of the problems as experienced by the adult learner.

Research Sample Selection

The first anthropological fieldwork method used was to establish a referral

network through which we identified the research population. We wanted the research population to include two main groups of adult learners: 1) those who were already engaged in educational pursuits, and 2) those who were interested in continuing their education but who were not yet participants.

We chose students enrolled in the University Without Walls program to represent the group of adults who had faced barriers to continuing their education and had overcome the barriers to participate in a degree program. The UWW students served as primary informants by providing names and addresses of people in their respective communities whom they knew to have expressed interest in continuing their education in some fashion beyond the high school level.

These secondary informant referrals, in turn, provided us with additional contacts, through which we eventually established four referral networks. The secondary informants identified through the referral networks were formally requested to participate in the study and were selected according to their availability for interviews and their geographic representation of the area.

The total research population consisted of twelve primary informants who were engaged in a degree program and thirty secondary informants who were interested in participating in educational activities. While the number of secondary informants was somewhat arbitrarily determined, we could have enlarged the sample had preliminary data analysis not revealed consistent patterns of responses.

Data Collection

The second method drawn from anthropological fieldwork was the ethnographic collection of data through in-depth personal interviews. We designed an interview schedule for primary informants that included seven open-ended questions. Each main question was followed by a series of five to ten probe questions which were used to assist the informant in expanding upon his or her responses to the open-ended question. The primary informant interviews were conducted by either the principle investigator or the MLC director.

Based on our experiences in using the interview schedule and on a preliminary analysis of the informant's responses, we designed an adapted interview schedule for the secondary informants. The majority of these interviews were conducted by three university undergraduates, who first participated in a week long training session.

The majority of the interviews with both informant groups ocurred some sixty miles from main headquarters in the informant's home or work place. In

order to reduce time and travel expenses, we often traveled in pairs to a given community, each scheduled with a full day of interviewing. The interviews lasted between 1-1½ hours, during which time the interviewer hand-recorded the informant's responses using the key word or key phrase method. This technique requires the interviewer to selectively record the informant's main expressions concerning an attitude, idea, action, event or person in response to a given question. Since the interview notes were the only data source, the interviewer had to allow time immediately after each interview to add full detail to the notes.

Data Analysis

The third anthropological technique was drawn from ethnoscience[8] and applied during the phase of data analysis. Through this technique, the raw data from the informant interview notes was manipulated through a complex process involving data organization and content analysis. For purposes of clarity, the process will be presented as consisting of six stages, with each stage representing an increased level of meaning emerging from the data.

It should be recognized that the data remains basically in control of the informants during all stages of the analysis process. It should also be noted that the data moves from increasing levels of specification to a level of generalization during the six-stage process. For example, in stages one, two, and three, the raw data is being worked toward specification; in stage four, the data from both informant groups is integrated which promotes a move toward generalization in stage five. Finally, in stage six, the data is formed into the final level of generalization.

The first stage involved organizing the raw data within a very general organizational framework. The forty-two sets of interview notes were separated into primary and secondary informant groups. Each set of interview notes was studied to identify key words and key phrases expressed by the informant. These data were organized under the general headings of the open-ended interview questions.

The second stage involved working with the data as organized under very general headings to form natural categories of responses. During this process, similar key responses were identified and grouped together to form response patterns. Categories were derived from the general theme expressed in each grouping. For example, from the open-ended question concerning the informant's "process of deciding about continuing his or her education", two categories were formed: "How barriers are perceived" and "How barriers might be overcome".

The third stage involved establishing sub-categories of responses. The data within the preceding response categories were analyzed further to uncover specific patterns of responses. These response patterns were then

analyzed to form specific sub-categories of responses. The general category of "how barriers are perceived" was further specified into such categories as "family responsibilities", "time", "finances", "access", and so forth.

The data from the primary and secondary informant groups were analyzed separately during the first three stages. In order to establish relationships between the two groups and to discover their similarities and dissimilarities, a fourth stage was added to the process. In this stage, both general and specific categories of responses were compared between informant groups and were found to be nearly identical. At this point, the categories were integrated to represent the total research population.

During the fifth stage, the process began to move out of the specification level to a more general level. In this process, the specific response patterns under each category were analyzed to uncover relationships between categories. For example, the responses in the categories of "family responsibilities" and "time" were found to contain similar variables, thus forming a relationship between the two categories. Based on the relationships identified between categories, it was then possible to draw inferences with respect to the informants' perceptions of various issues addressed in the interviews.

In the sixth and final stage, generalizations were formulated concerning the nature of the barriers adult learners face in continuing their education and the circumstances through which these barriers can be overcome. One such generalization, for example, was that barriers are derived from two sources: from the situations people face and from the particular value orientations held by individuals.

While this particular method of data analysis requires painstaking attention to detail and permits no short-cuts with respect to time, it has proven highly effective as a means to elicit how participants in a given culture structure their own meanings of critical issues.

By using an anthropological based approach to the barrier research, adult learners were allowed to actively participate in all key aspects of the research. They were engaged in the selection of the research population, in the identification of the important research issues, and in the interpretation of the data which they directly supplied. In addition, the voices of the adults were distinctly conveyed in the final research results. In the barrier research report, each pattern or signigicant finding was accompanied by representative verbatim responses from the informants. In this way, adult learners were able to speak to a wide audience about issues directly influencing their access to continuing education. In the following section of this paper, we will present the main findings of the research and their application to programs serving an adult clientele.

FINDINGS

THE PARTICIPANTS

The research population derived through the network sampling technique included 42 adults who had already expressed an interest in continuing their education. Most of them had completed nearly two years of prior postsecondary education and had participated in frequent informal learning experiences. All had faced barriers to continuing their education.

The 12 primary informants in Group I were engaged in a degree program. Eleven were enrolled in UWW/Morris, a program specifically designed to overcome barriers. The 30 secondary informants in Group II were not currently enrolled but had expressed an interest either in non-degree options or in obtaining a baccalaureate degree.[9]

Biographic data obtained as an initial part of the interview process showed that most of the 42 research participants were town dwellers, Minnesota born, and long time residents of the region. Most were married with children living at home. Over half were between 25 and 34 years old, with the age span extending from 20 through the late 50's. With two exceptions from Group II, all participants were Caucasian.[10] Because the referrals made through the network sampling technique were predominantly female, the participation of adult learners in this study was 71% female and 29% male.[11]

The participants themselves provided data directly about their educational goals and about the circumstances which made them difficult to overcome. The seven main discussion questions[12] focused on the subjects' formal and informal educational involvement and goals, the decision-making process affecting their educational participation, their membership in families and larger social groups, their familiarity with existing educational institutions and opportunities, and their perspectives toward education and learning.

THE BARRIER COMPONENTS

The chart following[13] lists the barriers identified by the people interviewed

in the order of the frequency with which each was discussed by the two groups. The barriers identified by Group I (those engaged in a degree program) and Group II (those interested in, but not pursuing, learning options) were found to be identical in name, nearly identical in makeup, and to differ only slightly in the ordering of their significance.[14]

Barriers Identified by Sample Population	Frequency of Response Group I	Group II
1) Access to Educational Facilities	all group ..	+ ½ group
2) Family Responsibilities	½ group ..	½ group
3) Finances	3/4 group ..	- ½ group
4) Time	3/4 group ..	+ 1/3 group
5) Motivation	1/3 group ..	+ 1/3 group

In the sections that follow I will discuss the components of the barriers identified by the people interviewed together with their reports of how barriers functioned within their lives. In addition, generalizations will be drawn from the data with their implications for adult educators including the Morris Learning Center staff. As in the original report, the adult learners will, as far as it is possible, speak for themselves.

In an attempt to suggest the process of data analysis used throughout this research, representative sample responses from the interviews will be presented which illustrate how categories and relationships emerged.

Barrier #1: Access to Educational Facilities

West Central Minnesota hosts some 17 postsecondary educational institutions. Seven grant the baccalaureate degree, two grant the Associate of Arts degree, and eight are vocational-technical schools. All of Group I and little better than ½ of Group II identified access as a barrier. Sample responses from the interviews[15] included the following: "The schools don't offer courses on what I need to take" . . . "There are not really that many classes available around here. Those we get have to be brought here by a college." "In order to enter the special R.N. program for a B.S. in nursing, I must first complete 45 college credits, but they won't accept my nursing credits. How do I do this at my age? The opportunities to do it aren't available here. I'd have to sell my home, give up a good job -- that's what I see as a barrier."

Based on statements like these, the lack of access to educational facilities was found to have two meanings to the people interviewed: first, that the

institutions within the area did not offer the type of curriculum, course, or program that was needed; or second, that access to the kinds of programs desired was at too great a distance.

Barrier #2: Family Responsibilities

Those members of the population with families usually functioned within the family as parents. Respondents said: "My children are too small and until they go to nursery school they must have babysitters. I can't ask my husband regularly to care for the children." "My family is very important -- they come first" . . . "if I did go to school, how would I support myself and the kids and maintain a house?" For half of each group, family responsibilities function as a barrier to educational participation 1) because of the age of the children, 2) because the family was placed at a higher priority than education, and 3) because money required for education was felt to be needed for the support of the family.[16]

Barrier #3: Finances

For 3/4 of Group I and slightly less than ½ of Group II, finances presented a barrier to continuing education. We were told: "Going to school is financially inhibiting. I would need a grant" . . . "I must keep employed. I have a wife and four kids. I can't stop everything and go back to school" and "I had never spent so much money on myself before. I had to be pretty certain it would pay for itself." Responses such as these revealed that to the population sampled, a financial barrier included: 1) money for tuition, 2) the need to maintain employment, and 3) the use of finances for the benefit of the family[17].

Barrier #4: Time

Time as a barrier to continuing education was referred to by 3/4 of Group I and by slightly more than 1/3 of Group II. For example, a woman in Group I said, "I really had to consider the time factor -- I knew I'd still be doing all the housework and be responsible for the kids. I really didn't feel I could manage the time to attend classes." A Group II woman said, "Kids need the security of having family around. You must learn to sacrifice when you have kids." Both groups needed "time to devote to school" and time "to spend with the family" and spoke about the problem of scheduling between the two.

Group II members identified a third factor, the need to spend time on the job. "My job requires a great deal of attention. I don't want to spread myself too thin."[18]

Barrier #5: Motivation

One-third of both groups identified motivation as a problem. Group I, most of whom were pursuing degrees, saw motivation as a potential barrier rather than as an actual deterrent. One said, "You need a high degree of self-motivation. You have to seriously question -- is it just a whim? You must have the discipline to keep at it, speaking from experience. You figure out your priorities and you stick to them." Group II spoke of a lack of self-discipline and an inability to set priorities. For example: "I'm not sure I could adapt. I'm not sure I have the study skills to cope with that. I'm groping and I really need direction" . . . "I've put things off because I felt other things were priority."[19] Motivation functioned as a barrier because of a lack of self-discipline or because of an inability to set priorities.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE BARRIERS

The people interviewed had identified and defined five educational barriers along with those factors that contributed to their functioning. The data had been ordered into groups, the responses had been integrated to establish the barrier categories. The first phase of data organization was complete. The second phase, that of data content analysis, involved identifying relationships among the patterns of responses. Through this analysis two distinct relationships among the barriers emerged which added to the complexity of each individual's situation.

First, we found that over 2/3 of the participants reported the presence of two or more barriers. The two barriers which each participant was likely to face at a minimum were "access to educational facilities" and "family responsibilities". Second, we found that the barriers were intricately related to one another. While each barrier had distinguishable characteristics, the characteristics were sometimes indistinct because of the close relationship between the barriers.

For example, the most frequently mentioned barrier, "access to educational facilities", was found to be linked with "finances" and/or "family responsibilities". Gaining access to educational offerings at a distance might take time away from the family or require someone to "give up a good job".

Similarly, "family responsibilities" was not only a barrier in itself, but appeared as a sub-point of both the "finances" and "time" barriers. The barrier "family responsibilities" was found to be linked with <u>all</u> of the other barriers. Families were found to influence the use of time, make demands on the use of finances, affect motivation, and act as a major force of support for or hindrance to access to educational facilities.[20]

The financial barrier was linked to family responsibilities because money used for educational purposes might mean "no bike for Christmas" or "my wife having to work". The "time" barrier was linked with finances because time must be spent "on the job" in order to "support myself and my family".

GENERALIZATIONS

Once the intricate relationships between the barriers were clear, it was possible to formulate generalizations based upon the patterns that had emerged. We had set out to explore how the adults' own perceptions of barriers contributed to the decisions they made about educational participation. The generalizations, based on the data, explained the derivation of barriers and the circumstances in which they might be overcome.

Generalization 1: Barriers are derived from two sources: they are derived from the situations people face and from the particular value orientations of the people themselves

"'Values' are viewed as those elements of one's life which have high priority, i.e., the important things in life as perceived by the population studied."[21]

Although none of the barriers could be isolated as being solely situational or solely value-related the "access" barrier and "financial" barrier stood out as highly situational.

For example, access is in part determined by where someone lives and by the availability of programs at the appropriate level in that geographic region. Attendance at educational institutions costs tuition money at a minimum. "Most people are not in the position to give up their full-time jobs to return to school."[22]

The barrier of "time" involved both situational and value-related elements. A certain amount of time is controlled by employment, child care, and other commitments. The problem of deciding to devote time to school or of scheduling between the demands of home and school is influenced by values.

Both "family responsibilities" and "motivation" were barriers containing strong value orientations. For example, a woman in Group I who "for years put my family first" had finally decided to pursue a degree because "I need to set priorities for myself. The family can adjust to me this time." In direct contrast were several women in Group II who were not pursuing their education because of family priorities. "My family is very important --

they come first." Their allegiance to their families is such that other things, e.g., an education, are viewed as something less than first priority.[23]

Generalization II: Value-related barriers require personal readjustments by the adult learner

The decision whether or not a barrier can be overcome is often a matter of individual value. The adult female who has determined that she may not go back to school until the children are in school is not likely to enroll until her situation changes and her children are in school. A person in need of greater self-discipline, reordered priorities, or a sense of security about her goals will not enroll until those problems can be solved. Group I enrolled students spoke of having to "put my family on a tighter schedule", having "less time for my family", and asking them "to help around the house". They had made readjustments in their personal family lives in order to work toward a degree.[24]

Most Group II people, though also valuing education, were not yet ready to make readjustments either because other competing values held a higher priority or because their situations had not been changed.

Generalization III: Situational barriers have the potential to be overcome by external sources

The barrier research had established that barriers can potentially be created from both external and internal sources and are likely to contain elements from both sources. External sources would be situational factors such as those represented in the barriers "access to educational facilities" and "finances".[25] Barriers which are largely situational hold the greatest promise of being overcome by external sources.

For Group I students "access to educational facilities" was overcome through the structure of the UWW program which made it possible for them to pursue a baccalaureate program in their home or job environment without moving away from either. For many Group II students the UWW program was not found to be appropriate, either because of the type of degree program they hoped to pursue, the level of the program desired, or because they sought non-degree options. Therefore the barrier remained.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADULT EDUCATORS

"External sources" capable of overcoming educational barriers clearly include

the educational institutions which offer programs to adults. The adult learners interviewed, by revealing their educational needs, interests, and barriers, offered direction to educational institutions serving adults.

Following are characteristics of the adult learners we interviewed together with a beginning list of the considerations they suggest for adult educators:

1. Most of the population studied have interests that are professionally related.[26] Educators could consider developing and offering accessible courses and degree routes that relate educational resources to professional interests.

2. Because of their commitment to their families, jobs, and home ownership, adult learners need classes provided within their communities at convenient times. Educators should consider bringing educational resources to the community rather than requiring adult learners primarily to come on campus.[27]

3. Adult learners distinguish between learning -- an internal occurrence -- and education, which they link to external sources.[28] They typically have educational experiences gained through both formal and experiential settings.[29] Educators should consider the range of experiences adults bring to the formal academic setting[30] and provide programs and courses that merge informal learning within a formal education.

4. Adult learners assign similar values to an educated person and to a successful person. They are interested in the application of education to their daily lives.[31] Educators should consider ways of providing education[32] so that it is more readily consumed within the course of daily living.

5. Adult learners, even those with clearly expressed educational goals, conduct limited investigations into educational opportunities and have limited knowledge of existing area educational institutions.[33] Educators might consider both the extent to which existing programs are publicized or promoted and the establishment of communication links among sources of educational information.[34]

6. Finally, although value barriers are the most difficult to overcome, educators might consider providing services which assist adults in establishing educational goals and priorities.[35]

In designing the barrier research, we had sought to use methodology which would supply information that could be applied to actual programming possibilities for adult learners in West Central Minnesota. In this final section, I would like to comment briefly on the application of the barrier

research to the programs offered through the Morris Learning Center.

For the Morris Learning Center staff, the barrier research has provided a conceptual framework for programmatic decisions and the setting of priorities. We have made a greater effort to publicize available short-term external learning options such as independent correspondence study. We have also designed new ways to make on-campus courses available to off-campus students, such as audio taping course lectures while they are given. Whenever possible, we now take information sessions about educational opportunities to outlying areas rather than holding them only on campus, and our publicity efforts are on-going. We have established communication links with other postsecondary schools in the area and hope within the near future to coordinate our services regionally.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of the barrier research has been the greater understanding that we now bring to our advising. Within the context of the barrier research, we view each request for information as an important event. We no longer are surprised that adults know so little about the learning options available to them. We provide whatever assistance we can with on-campus procedures.

It is not unusual for our staff to talk with a prospective student infrequently over a period of years about what (s)he might do "someday". With the help of the barrier research, we have come to understand why there is so often a time gap between the interest that is expressed in educational opportunities and registration in a specific learning option. Statements by adults introduced by "When my youngest goes to school" or "Maybe the year after next" are projections rather than statements of evasion. The time gap is explained by values and in no way diminishes that adult's commitment to education. Given the responsibilities of adults and the inaccessibility of programs for them, the adult commitment to learning often extending over a period of years is indeed impressive. In planning college programs with individual adults, discussing their values provides a time frame in which to plan or delineates a period of waiting in which to provide support.

The 42 participants in the barrier research shared with us their educational aspirations. Within the context of their individual situations, they are proponents of lifelong learning. All of them faced obstacles which either prevented them or slowed them down in their efforts to obtain an education. Their commitment to education like that of many others who contact the Learning Center is high enough to warrant belief in their willingness to carry out their goals given the opportunity to do so.[36] We see our role as adult advocates who try to locate or to provide that opportunity.

The barrier research raised other questions of access in addition to those that it answered. It has told us about a special group of adults in a rural

setting in West Central Minnesota. How representative of this region are the 42 people with whom we spoke? What are the differences in access problems between degree and non-degree seekers? To what extent does what we learned apply in other geographic regions or in urban settings? What especially are women's perceptions of the patterns, goals and barriers they face as they re-enter postsecondary education? These are some of the unanswered questions that call for further exploration.

FOOTNOTES

1. James O'Toole, "Education, Work and Quality of Life", in Dyckman Vermilc, ed., Lifelong Learners - A New Clientele for Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1974), p. 13.

2. Gale Jensen, A.A. Liveright, and Wilbur Hallenbeck, eds., Adult Education: Outlines of an Emerging Field of University Study (Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1964), p. iv.

3. Malcom Knowles, Higher Adult Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969), p. 23.

4. John W.C. Johnstone and Ramon J. Rivera, Volunteers for Learning (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965), p. 214.

5. Ibid., 4, pp. 214-215.

6. Southeast Adult Education Study, Survey Report No. 1 (May) and No. 6 (June) (Division of Program and Staff Development, University of Wisconsin, 1973).

7. Richard E. Peterson and J.B. Lon Hefferlin, Postsecondary Alternatives to Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults, Final Report, Prepared for the California State Legislature (Sacramento, California, 1975).

8. Ethnoscience is defined as "a mode of eliciting, in a rigorous way, the means by which a culture structures meaning for the participants in that culture", in Raoul Naroll and Ronald Cohen, eds., A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 11.

9. Catherine Marienau, Unpublished report, "Study of Barriers to Participation in Postsecondary Education as Perceived By Adults In West Central Minnesota" (Morris Learning Center, Continuing Education and Regional Programs, University of Minnesota, Morris, January 1976), p. 12.

10. Ibid., p. 14.

11. Ibid., pp. 75-77.

12. Ibid., p. iv-ix.

13. Ibid., p. 25.

14. Ibid., p. 24.

15. Ibid., pp. 25-26.

16. Ibid., pp. 27-28.

17. Ibid., pp. 28-30.

18. Ibid., pp. 30-32.

19. Ibid., pp. 32-33.

20. Ibid., pp. 59-60.

21. Ibid., p. 61.

22. Ibid., p. 63.

23. Ibid., p. 62.

24. Ibid., pp. 67-68.

25. Ibid., p. 69.

26. Ibid., p. 70.

27. Ibid., p. 88.

28. Ibid., p. 79.

29. Ibid., p. 73.

30. Ibid., p. 87.

31. Ibid., pp. 71-73.

32. Ibid., p. 87.

33. Ibid., p. 82.

34. Ibid., p. 86.

35. Ibid., p. 87.

36. Ibid., p. 83.

Joint authorship extends throughout this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jensen, Gale, A.A. Liveright, and Wilbur Hallenbeck, eds. Adult Education: Outlines of an Emerging Field of University Study. Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1964.

Johnstone, John W.C. and Ramon J. Rivera. Volunteers for Learning. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

Knowles, Malcom. Higher Adult Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Marienau, Catherine. Unpublished report. "Study of Barriers in Postsecondary Education as Perceived by Adults in West Central Minnesota." Morris Learning Center, Continuing Education and Regional Programs, University of Minnesota, Morris, January 1976.

Narroll, Raoul and Ronald Cohen, eds. A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

O'Toole, James. "Education, Work and Quality of Life." In Lifelong Learners - A New Clientele for Higher Education, Dyckman Vermilye, ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

Peterson, Richard E. and J.B. Lon Hefferlin. Postsecondary Alternatives to Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults. Final Report. Prepared for the California State Legislature, Sacramento, California, 1975.

Southeast Adult Education Study. Survey Report No. 1 (May) and No. 6 (June). Division of Program and Staff Development, University Extension, University of Wisconsin, 1973.